

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 194

SP 034 280

AUTHOR Tierney, Dennis; And Others
TITLE Assessment Component of the California New Teacher Project: Alternative Models of New Teacher Assessment and Support.
INSTITUTION Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY California Commission of Teacher Credentialing, Sacramento.; California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE Feb 92
CONTRACT TCC-CO21
NOTE 32p.; For related documents, see ED 323 197, ED 342 761, and SP 034 278-282.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Change Strategies; *Cost Estimates; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Inservice Teacher Education; Models; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS *California New Teacher Project

ABSTRACT

Finding ways to improve the assessment of beginning teachers is part of an effort to assure that fully certified teachers possess the professional knowledge and skills necessary for competence in contemporary classrooms. Research done by the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) suggests that some knowledge and skills cannot be fully learned in preservice teacher education programs. Following a review of current licensure practices in California and the value of linking teacher support and assessment with each other, this report describes three models of alternative assessment and two options for implementing them. The models are: Research Dissemination and Technical Assistance Model, Program Review with Technical Assistance Model, and Staged Assessment with Technical Assistance Model. The description of each model includes an overview; a discussion of the standards, methods, technical quality, purposes and uses, and advantages and disadvantages of the model; and probable costs of adopting the model. The models draw on findings of the CNTP, particularly the pilot testing of alternative assessment approaches and the initial development of a framework of knowledge, skills, and abilities that teachers can be expected to attain within the first 3 years of full-time teaching. Alternative models for the assessment of beginning teachers would permit individuals to begin a teaching career with the support of experienced teachers and to undergo an assessment that would permit candidates to demonstrate their fitness for teaching in California schools. (LL)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

SP



Far West
LABORATORY

ED355194

**ASSESSMENT COMPONENT OF THE
CALIFORNIA NEW TEACHER PROJECT:**

**ALTERNATIVE MODELS OF NEW TEACHER
ASSESSMENT AND SUPPORT**

FEBRUARY, 1992

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Rose

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP034280

This report is based upon work performed pursuant to Contract TCC-C021 with the California Interagency Task Force of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing and the California State Department of Education New Teacher Project. The contents do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of these agencies and the accuracy of the information is the sole responsibility of the Far West Laboratory.

Assessment Component of the
California New Teacher Project:

Alternative Models of New Teacher
Assessment and Support

Dennis Tierney
Claudia Long
Edys Quellmalz
Kendyll Stansbury
Gary Estes

February 1992

Far West Laboratory for
Educational Research and Development
San Francisco, California

Introduction

Almost every commission, task force, and policy report on the state of public education in America has identified the improvement of teachers' knowledge, skills, and abilities as a key element in the nation-wide goal of improving the performance of our schools. Efforts to improve teaching have focussed on both support for and assessment of beginning teachers as the growth in public school enrollment brings a new generation of teachers into the classroom. The research done by the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) in the area of support for beginning teachers has made it clear that some critical knowledge and crucial skills cannot be fully learned in a pre-service teacher education program. An induction period in which the neophyte teacher works with colleagues in a supportive environment is necessary to the development of that teacher. Finding ways to improve the assessment of beginning teachers is part of the effort to assure the public that fully certified teachers possess the professional knowledge and skills necessary for competence in contemporary classrooms.

Following this view, the California New Teacher Project undertook an analysis of alternative models for the assessment of beginning teachers that would permit individuals to begin a teaching career with sufficient support from experienced teachers and other support providers, and to undergo a broad, authentic assessment of their knowledge and skills that would permit the candidates to demonstrate their fitness for teaching in contemporary California schools.

Relationship of the Models to the California New Teacher Project

This report describes three possible models of beginning teacher assessment that draw on the findings of the California New Teacher Project, particularly the pilot testing of alternative assessment approaches and the initial development of a framework of knowledge, skills, and abilities that teachers can be expected to attain within the first two to three years of full-time teaching. In addition, to ensure that the proposed models retain current effective practices and make appropriate improvements, the authors reviewed the findings of the CNTP study of current admission and evaluation practices in a sample of California teacher credential programs, and hiring and evaluation practices in a sample of public school districts. By drawing on the research efforts already completed by the California New Teacher Project, this description of alternative assessment models would provide useful options for policymakers to improve the profession of teaching in California. Before describing the three basic models and the options for implementing them, it is important to review the current legal status of licensure practices in California and to examine the value of linking beginning teacher support and assessment with each other.

Current Assessment Practices

California law requires that all classroom teachers in public schools possess the appropriate credential for the instructional services they provide. Such credentials typically are earned through a program of study at a college or university that includes both academic work and supervised field experience. In addition, candidates must pass certain state examinations of basic skills proficiencies in reading, writing, and mathematics and must meet current regulations regarding the absence of certain criminal convictions. Once enrolled in an approved program of study, candidates develop certain defined

competencies, complete a sufficient amount of supervised field experience in classrooms, and demonstrate competence in the subjects they would teach.

Representatives of the approved program of preparation make a licensure recommendation to the state credential agency - the Commission on Teacher Credentialing - based on their assessment of the candidate's competence in at least 10 state-defined areas of general pedagogy. The state licensing agency reviews the recommendation, but makes no direct assessment of the candidate's teaching abilities.

Candidates earn one of two basic types of credentials. The Preliminary Credential is valid for five years and requires the teacher to complete an additional year of academic study (typically 30 semester units or 45 quarter units of study) that includes three mandated topics - health education, computer literacy, and mainstreaming.¹ This credential was intended to be the initial credential for most California teachers. The idea was to encourage additional professional training after employment commenced that would aid beginning teachers in developing their skills. Many teachers who earn the Preliminary Credential often meet the additional educational requirements by preparing for a career outside the regular classroom (e.g., earning a Special Education Credential or a Preliminary Administrative Services credential). This does not appear to have the effect on improving classroom teaching that was initially intended by lawmakers.

The other type of credential is the Professional Clear Credential that was originally intended to be the second credential earned by teachers. This credential requires the candidate to complete the equivalent of a year of study beyond the baccalaureate degree, including the defined topics mentioned above. It is renewable every five years, if the candidate designs and completes an individual program of professional development activities. These activities are broadly defined in the law and range from college courses to systematic curriculum development activities. The Professional Clear Credential is the initial credential earned by most new teachers in California, because most candidates complete the baccalaureate degree before entering teacher credential programs and, thus, claim their professional training as the post-baccalaureate year. Most students find it possible to complete the state-mandated studies of health, computers, and mainstreaming during that year of study. Thus, the current two-tier credential structure is not providing the kind of developmental preparation for teachers that the framers of the existing licensure law had in mind.

A Rationale for Linking Support and Assessment

Recent research on teacher knowledge and skill development makes it clear that teachers require time under regular work conditions (e.g., full-time teaching in their own classrooms) to develop all the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed in contemporary classrooms. Pre-service teacher education programs cannot provide the needed conditions and environment; development through support and additional training during the early years of employment is crucial if teacher competence is to be fully attained. The findings of the CNTP support this notion and make clear the kinds of support that are most helpful to beginning teachers.

¹ This area of study is a result of PL 94-142 which mandated the placement of special education students in regular classrooms wherever possible, commonly called "mainstreaming." Regular classroom teachers must know and understand the educational needs of these children.

Other research findings from the CNTP indicate that teachers must receive detailed feedback in order to continue their development, and that current assessment practices do not provide sufficient information to new teachers, their supervisors, or their mentors. The fragmentation of assessment practices, the lack of congruence within and across pre-service and in-service programs for beginning teachers about the definition of competent teaching, and the uneven technical quality of assessment practices all reduce the value of current assessments in contributing to beginning teacher development. Improved programs of assistance and training for new teachers should prepare them to perform well in an authentic, valid assessment system, which should tap the same knowledge, skills, and abilities that are emphasized in the support programs. Thus, support and assessment practices must be improved jointly if the public is to get full benefit from the findings of the CNTP.

An Ideal System of New Teacher Support and Assessment

Concerns about new teachers that have been expressed in many reports and studies show that current support and assessment practices are insufficient to meet the needs of beginning teachers in contemporary schools. The CNTP has identified many characteristics of an ideal support and assessment system. Such a system is probably not feasible given the size and complexity of California's public school system. However, the following characteristics of an ideal system could be useful in judging the qualities of the proposed alternative assessment models:

- (1) The ideal system for supporting and assessing teachers during preparation and early service would be rigorous (i.e., have high levels of expectations), thorough (i.e., cover all components of good teaching), coherent (i.e., follow the course of teacher development), and comprehensive (i.e., feature both formative and summative aspects).
- (2) The components of good teaching that would be developed and assessed include:
 - Subject-matter Knowledge (breadth and depth)
 - General Pedagogy
 - Subject-specific Pedagogy
 - Knowledge of Students (multicultural/multilingual)
 - Professional Perspectives (law, history, philosophy)
- (3) Support providers and the assessors of student teachers and beginning teachers would be thoroughly trained in a variety of assessment practices and would be monitored by appropriate organizations to ensure they complete their assigned tasks properly.
- (4) Each student or beginning teacher would receive frequent formative feedback and would have multiple opportunities to practice and improve on areas of weakness prior to being assessed summatively.
- (5) Both the institution of higher education (IHE) and the local educational agency (LEA) assessment practices would include utilization of previous evaluations within and across the two organizations. The cumulative evaluation of a candidate for professional licensure and/or tenure would draw on all previous evaluations of the teacher.

- (6) Any assessment criteria adopted by the state, IHEs, or LEAs would accommodate diverse teaching settings so a candidate could meet adopted standards in any school and in appropriate assignments.
- (7) The assessment plan would attend to all areas (breadth) of a common teaching framework at a level of skill (i.e., depth) appropriate for beginning teachers.
- (8) The assessment plan would involve more than one assessor and more than one source of evidence for teacher competence.

While this list of ideal support and assessment system characteristics is not exhaustive, it provides criteria for examining the alternative models of assessment.

In California there is no system of teacher assessment that spans the pre-service and early years of teaching. Instead, there is a set of weakly connected assessment practices in teacher education programs and in local educational agencies that are based on uncoordinated laws and regulations, different theoretical and philosophical bases, and varying levels of technical quality and rigor. The result of these multiple disparities is excessive and repeated evaluations of a few teacher characteristics and behaviors (e.g., classroom control, proper paperwork, punctuality) and a paucity of information on other, more important qualifications and professional practices (e.g., subject-specific pedagogy, diagnostic skills, depth of knowledge in subject matter). For example, the study of assessment approaches used currently by pre-service teacher credential programs and school districts suggests that they place a high emphasis on observation of classroom management and other general pedagogical skills.

General Principles of the Proposed Models

Certain elements of support and assessment are found in all of the proposed models, and certain assumptions about legal and fiscal matters related to beginning-teacher support and assessment are made. The common elements and assumptions are stated below, as an introduction to the individual models.

All the proposed models assume that teacher credential programs and school districts would continue to emphasize general pedagogical principles in their assessments. Some models would require the use of assessment approaches that focus on subject-specific pedagogy and knowledge of students, while others only recommend them. The intent of all the models is to advance the practice of beginning teacher assessment beyond the current focus on general pedagogy, especially classroom management.

To achieve coherence and thoroughness in the assessment of credential candidates and beginning teachers, the state must work with teacher educators and school district personnel to complete the development of an appropriate framework for teaching that specifies performance standards for each element of the framework. Such a framework would enable both pre-service and in-service programs to shape their content to address common concerns and should provide significant benefits to all teachers.

Changes in beginning-teacher support and assessment practices would require comprehensive training for support providers and assessors if the proposed changes are to be successful. All three models call for the establishment of a technical assistance network to assist colleges, universities, and school districts in providing the necessary training. The preliminary work accomplished by the CNTP must be translated into working plans and documents that would guide local deliberations. Effective training would be needed by teacher educators and assessors. Administrative credential programs also must reflect the knowledge created by the CNTP. This work must precede the implementation of beginning teacher support and assessment activities.

The proposed models would require the investment of new funds in the expansion of CNTP support programs and training of support providers to enable each beginning teacher to reach the level of performance indicated in the State Teaching Framework. At an average state cost of \$5,000 per teacher per year² for 12,000 new teachers for two years, first year support costs would be \$60 million, and second year support costs would be \$120 million. Several existing support programs established by the districts or by the state (e.g., Mentor Teacher Program and staff development programs) should be used to support the costs of assisting new teachers.

Regardless of the funding source, the scope and content of assessments of beginning teachers must be congruent with support provided so all beginning teachers have an opportunity to achieve the expected level of competence prior to being assessed. Moreover, teachers who experience difficulty in achieving such competence must participate in focused support activities and, possibly, have additional time to meet the new standards. If such a connection between support and assessment cannot be maintained, two of the three models should not be implemented.

Two of the proposed models address the two-tier credential concept and call for all candidates to receive the preliminary credential as the initial credential. These teachers would earn the professional clear credential after employment begins, by completing an induction program of support and assessment. The other model would leave current credentialing practices in place. Additionally, the relationship between credentialing and tenure is addressed in only one option of one model. Since tenure is now awarded to successful teachers after the second full year of teaching, delaying assessment of teachers for professional licensure would raise questions about current tenure laws and district employment practices. A delay of one year in granting professional licensure is possible if the assessment begins in the initial year of teaching, but any delay beyond the two-year limit would require changes in tenure law.

Any proposed model adopted by the state must be evaluated by an outside agency in order to determine future modifications and report to policymakers on the impact of such a program. The evaluation agency should be selected as early as possible so that crucial information about procedures and practices can be captured for analysis. Once the program is implemented, the evaluator would need to make field visits and classroom observations, review documents, and conduct interviews with all the participants. The agency selected should make

² This is the 1989-90 average support costs per teacher as reported by the external evaluator of the support component of the CNTP.

annual reports and a final evaluation assessment after three to four years of full operation.

Overview of the Proposed Models and Implementation Options

Three models of alternative assessment and two options for implementing them are described. One model has two options that permit choice in the number of assessment approaches. Each model is described separately and the description includes an overview, a discussion of the standards, methods, technical quality, purposes and uses, advantages and disadvantages of the model, and the probable costs of adopting the model. Where appropriate, the probable costs have been divided into start-up costs and ongoing costs. Since it is possible to modify the time and pattern of the models' initiation, options for implementation are presented.

All models assume that the proposed framework of beginning teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities has been thoroughly reviewed, modified, and approved by the educational community. All models also assume that a concomitant beginning teacher support plan would be in place in every district and would be sufficient to meet the demands imposed on new teachers by the proposed models. They do not include a detailed description of the developmental work needed to bring the framework into full use in California and do not discuss the critical work necessary to bring the existing alternative assessment approaches, pilot-tested in the CNTP, to the point of full implementation.

The Research Dissemination and Technical Assistance Model

This model represents a minimal effort to implement the findings of the California New Teacher Project. It does not implement candidate-centered assessment for professional licensure and would not provide new, useful, statewide information about beginning teacher knowledge, skills, or abilities. It does implement the proposed state framework for beginning teachers and encourage experimentation with alternative approaches to teacher assessment by providing technical assistance to teacher education programs and local school districts. Such assistance should ensure that any voluntary adoptions of the CNTP research findings benefit from earlier efforts.

The Program Review with Technical Assistance Model

This model represents a moderate effort to implement the findings of the California New Teacher Project. It duplicates the existing approach used by teacher credential programs to assess teachers for initial licensure. School districts would act as agents for the state and make recommendations about employed teachers seeking the professional credential. Such decisions can be coterminous with local district decisions about tenure, with an appeals process conducted by a regional review panel to protect teachers from unfair decisions. The model would allow for planned differences in the scope, content, and methods of assessment activities to acknowledge the importance of district preferences while providing significant technical assistance to credential programs and school districts desiring such help. It does add significant state oversight of local district assessment practices that may necessitate additional staff. It does not mandate uniform assessment of candidates, which reduces the ability of this model to provide accurate, useful information that could serve as a basis for decisions about teachers' credentials.

The Staged Assessment with Technical Assistance Model

This model represents the most comprehensive use of the California New Teacher Project findings. It recognizes the legitimate role of the state in establishing standards for professional licensure through the selection of assessment approach(es) and the training of individuals who would conduct the assessments. It uses the research information generated by the CNTP to connect support and assessment through the proposed framework of beginning teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities. It bridges the pre-service to in-service gap by setting clear goals with specific standards for all beginning teachers in the state. This model also would provide the most useful and reliable information about beginning teachers and their levels of competence in teaching. Depending on the option chosen, tenure laws may have to change to accommodate the time needed for support prior to the planned assessment(s). This model also would cost substantially more than the other models to initiate and maintain, particularly if the state pays the costs of the evaluators while they are conducting the assessments.

Model One: Research Dissemination and Technical Assistance Model

Overview

Under the Research Dissemination and Technical Assistance Model, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) and the California Department of Education (CDE) would (1) disseminate the research findings of the California New Teacher Project (CNTP) on support programs and alternative assessments of beginning teachers, (2) complete the development of a proposed framework of new teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities that would serve as the basis for criteria for new teacher support and assessment, and (3) establish a technical assistance network to help teacher education programs and local school districts implement the disseminated findings. Following the adoption of the framework, the dissemination of research information, and the creation of the technical assistance network, both agencies would initiate legal and administrative changes in the standards for pre-service and in-service teacher competence to align them with the adopted framework and the disseminated research findings. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing would modify the standards of program quality and effectiveness that govern all pre-service teacher credential programs, giving particular attention to Category V on Candidate Competence. The California Department of Education would seek legislation to modify the portions of the Stull Act that establish broad domains for assessing teacher competence. Both agencies also would require that future support activities for beginning teachers sponsored or approved by them demonstrate a clear connection between the adopted framework and the proposed support activities. This model would not alter current credential requirements or tenure laws. The changes proposed in this model would create a closer link between pre-service and in-service criteria for beginning teacher competence.

Standards

The standards for supporting and assessing beginning teaching employed in this model are derived from the framework for beginning teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities developed by the CTC and CDE. Existing procedures and instruments for teacher assessment would remain in force at the pre-service and in-service levels. The model requires the CTC to modify Category V of the current standards of program quality (used to evaluate and approve teacher credential programs) in light of the new expectations for beginning teachers as defined in the framework. These modifications may, in turn, require institutions of higher education with approved basic credential programs to make changes in their assessment practices and/or instruments. Such changes would show how they are assuring that all candidates they recommend for a credential have demonstrated competence in the appropriate areas described in the adopted framework. For school districts, the model requires the CDE to seek legislation to modify the Stull Act provisions, which define the categories of teacher competence to be assessed. These provisions would have to be changed to match the appropriate areas of the framework.

Methods

A proposed framework of the knowledge, skills, and abilities expected of beginning teachers in California, based on the findings of the CNTP, would be completed and widely disseminated by the CTC and CDE and further modifications would be made after a thorough examination of the framework by all interested parties has concluded. Once adopted by the respective agencies, legal and administrative changes in pre-service and in-service standards of teacher competence would be initiated. During this period, both agencies would engage in training activities with their respective clients (i.e., credential programs for the CTC and school districts for the CDE) to provide assistance in the modification of programs of preparation, support, and assessment. Following a suitable training and transition period, all approved programs of teacher preparation would be required to meet the modified Category V program standards, and all school districts would be required to meet the revised Stull Act.

While the proposed new framework is being implemented, the respective agencies would be conducting development activities designed to create a set of useable assessment practices and approaches for beginning classroom teachers. In addition, interested organizations would be invited to attend information and training sessions on the alternative assessment approaches piloted by the CNTP. While participation in these activities would not require changes in teacher assessment practices by those who attend, it would provide interested and willing organizations with the latest information on ways of improving their assessment practices. Agencies that do adopt alternative assessment practices would receive technical assistance through a state-supported network that would include periodic training workshops, updates on new research findings, and dissemination of exemplary practices. Both agencies would monitor these efforts to improve teacher support and assessment in the state, and would provide regular evaluation reports to policymakers.

Technical Quality

This model does not necessarily improve the technical quality of assessment practices because it focusses exclusively on assessment *criteria* for both pre-

service teacher education and in-service assessment practices. Model One does not address issues of assessment rigor, thoroughness, fairness, consistency, or the helpfulness of assessment information. None of the findings from the pilot-testing of alternative assessment approaches would be mandated for implementation. The creation of a technical assistance network supported by the state would provide quality assurance for those organizations that choose to participate in the reform of beginning teacher assessment.

When the CTC adopts the standards for beginning teacher competence based on the new state framework, it is possible that the candidate assessments conducted by teacher education programs for initial teaching credentials would reflect more realistic perceptions and, perhaps, higher expectations for beginning teachers. Much of the actual impact on teacher credential programs of the revised standards and the criteria for determining competence would depend on the amount and quality of training for assessors (e.g., university supervisors of student teaching, cooperating classroom teachers) at the pre-service level. This caveat also applies to modifications of the Stull Act that govern evaluations of classroom teachers. The technical assistance network may provide help in the area of assessor training.

Purposes and Uses

The principal purpose of this model is to provide a low-cost means of improving existing practices for beginning teacher support and assessment. The model proposes major modifications in state standards, but avoids the creation of extensive additions to state staff. It takes existing practices of assessment at the pre-service and in-service levels and seeks to influence them through the dissemination of new standards of beginning teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities based on the new teaching framework. The technical assistance component provides ongoing assistance for both pre-service and in-service assessment needs and parallels the beginning teacher support element by ensuring that all interested organizations have access to high quality help. All other research findings from the three years of the CNTF remain as recommendations to interested organizations.

Through the proposed framework, Model One would create a common language for discussing, supporting, and assessing beginning teacher competence. It provides for a stronger link between teacher credential programs and the early years of teaching by highlighting, from the framework, the developmental nature of teaching and the kinds of knowledge and skills that beginning teachers can be expected to know and demonstrate.

This model does not mandate any new credentialing structure after employment commences, and it permits institutions of higher education and local school districts wide latitude in selecting instruments to verify the basic skills and abilities identified in the modified CTC Standards and the modified Stull Act.

The advantages and disadvantages of Model One are summarized below.

Advantages of Model One

- Maximizes university control of credential recommendations
- Maximizes local control of retention decisions

- Provides technical assistance for improving support and assessment activities at pre-service and in-service levels
- Creates a common language for discussing and assessing beginning teacher competencies

Disadvantages of Model One

- Does not ensure the use of high-quality assessments
- Does not address the goal of further professionalizing teaching
- Leaves the choice of assessment practices to preferences of individual credential programs and individual school districts, thus preserving the existing fragmentation of pre-service and in-service teacher education
- Does not foster consistency in credentialing or employment decisions
- Does not utilize fully the findings of the CNTF (e.g., ignores the developmental nature of learning to teach)

Probable Costs

Once the proposed state framework of beginning teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities has been fully developed and approved, the only new state costs involved in this model are those associated with the training activities and technical assistance network proposed as a final part of the dissemination phase. Representatives of the 73 approved teacher credential programs and representatives from the 1000+ school districts in the state would require education and training in the proposed new teaching framework and its implications for assessing and recommending credential candidates or assessing and retaining teachers. While some training can be done through publications, videotapes, and other indirect means of informing people, some direct training sessions would be required. These can be scheduled around the state and during other regular meetings of the groups most affected by these changes. Staff time would be needed to prepare the training materials and to conduct the sessions themselves. If a year is allowed for the training and dissemination activities, it is possible that 20 or 30 two-day training sessions could be held around the state. This would permit audience size to remain well below 100 individuals per session and help discussion and small group activities.

Follow-up activities through the technical assistance network would require full-time consultants with support staff who can provide ongoing help to teacher education programs and school districts. Some assistance can be provided through teleconferencing, computer networks, and other "high-tech" systems. Over time, regional training and technical assistance sites can provide the bulk of the help.

There would be costs to institutions of higher education and local school districts as they modify their support and assessment plans to make them congruent with the State Teaching Framework. It is expected that these would not require new permanent positions and would be managed within existing budget

allocations. These costs, therefore, are not included in the following budget estimates.

Probable Costs:³ Research Dissemination Workshops

Personnel 200 staff days @ \$318.53 ⁴ per day	\$ 63,706
Travel and Per Diem for 4 Workshop Presenters 25 workshops, 2 days per diem	\$ 33,200
Facility Rental @ \$250 per rental	\$ 12,500
Materials @ \$10 per participant	\$ 20,000
Postage @ \$2 per participant	\$ 4,000
Participant Travel @ \$12 per participant	\$ 24,000
Participant Per Diem @ \$9.50 per participant	<u>\$ 19,000</u>
Total Costs for Research Dissemination Workshops	\$176,406

³ This budget is calculated on needing 25 two-day regional meetings, anticipating a total of 2,000 participants, paying participants' automobile mileage of 50 miles, paying for a per diem lunch for participants, and paying standard rental on hotel meeting rooms.

⁴ Staff daily salary was calculated on a mid-range State Education Consultant 1992 compensation with benefits and a work year of 250 days.

Probable Costs: Technical Assistance Network (per year)

Personnel	6 FTE Consultants - Mid-range	\$329,148
	Employee Benefits	\$148,644
Consultant Travel and Per Diem ⁵		\$ 31,104
Materials & Computer Support ⁶		\$ 15,000
Office Support Staff Salary		\$ 29,232
	Employee Benefits	\$ 11,108
Office Supplies/Telephone/Postage		<u>\$ 7,000</u>
Total Annual Costs for Technical Assistance Network		\$571,236
TOTAL COST OF MODEL ONE		\$747,642

⁵ Travel costs are based on bi-monthly in-state travel for each consultant at state rates.

⁶ This includes computer support, equipment for connecting to existing networks, and instructional materials.

⁷ This number was derived from taking the total number of school districts in California and subtracting from it the number of smaller and/or rural districts which may develop a consortia approach. The number could reach 900.

⁸ By using 5 sites, three days of reading and commenting, and ten evaluators at each site, no evaluator will have to read and analyze more than five plans per day. This should give time for monitoring evaluator consistency and second readings of plans judged inadequate.

Model Two: Program Review with Technical Assistance Model

Overview

The Program Review with Technical Assistance Model is a set of programs of support and assessment for beginning teachers developed at the local level but state reviewed and approved. It encourages formative and summative evaluation by linking support and assessment activities. The model parallels the current state practice of setting standards of program quality for pre-service teacher education, and allowing individual approaches to meeting those standards. By encouraging local districts or consortia of districts (which can include universities) to create individual programs of support and assessment within state specifications, the model adheres to the tradition of local control of schools and acknowledges the significant variations across California's school districts. Districts and consortia of districts would receive technical assistance in a manner similar to the Research Dissemination Model.

The model also introduces the concept that the initial credential for teaching would be the Preliminary Credential, valid for a fixed period and linked to completion of a formal program of support designed to assist the teacher's development. The Professional Credential would be awarded to those teachers who demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and abilities as defined in the state Teaching Framework (STF).

The standards that the state would establish for the local support and assessment programs would be drawn from the research conducted by the California New Teacher Project (CNTP). The CNTP research project has generated data on the appropriateness of various methods of supporting and assessing beginning teacher competence. The CNTP has also conducted a survey and analysis of existing assessment practices in California teacher education programs and local school districts. The program review model assumes that the general findings of the CNTP would be disseminated and that a proposed framework for beginning teaching would be extensively discussed with the California educational community and, after incorporating their revisions, adopted by the appropriate state agencies.

Besides disseminating the findings from the CNTP research on support and assessment, the state would use these research findings to develop standards that must be reflected in the support and assessment activities proposed by school districts. The state also would require that the adopted framework for beginning teacher competence become the conceptual basis for defining and specifying the local programs of support and assessment. To ensure equity and fairness, the state would require that school districts participate in periodic reviews of these local support and assessment plans by teams of trained evaluators.

All districts wishing to hire beginning teachers would receive training in the use of the recommended approaches and the adopted State Teaching Framework. Upon completion of the training, the districts would be required to develop a support and assessment plan or work collaboratively with other districts and/or institutions of higher education to develop a group plan, secure the agreement of the relevant bargaining agent(s), and submit the plan to the state for review and approval. The state would judge the adequacy of these plans according to adopted criteria and standards. Technical assistance would be provided to districts during

the planning and development phase and during implementation to ensure that beginning teachers receive high quality support and assessment.

When a candidate completes the required number of years of service under the preliminary credential and applies for the professional teaching credential, districts and consortia, having evaluated the candidate's relevant teaching skills, would affirm whether or not, in their professional judgment, candidates meet all requirements of the approved plan, and, upon submission of appropriate documentation of teacher assessments by the district and in the absence of any contrary evidence, the CTC would accept the recommendation of the local school districts and consortia and grant the Professional Credential. Teachers can appeal recommendations to deny the Professional Credential to a regional review panel which would be appointed, trained, and overseen by the state.

Standards

Although this model adopts the anticipated state framework of knowledge and skills for beginning teachers that would set the minimum expectations for professional credential holders, it simultaneously accommodates the extensive variation that exists in California public schools. Individual districts could use different methods to verify the competencies established in the framework, and could seek additional information for local purposes. This model employs an inferential approach in that the state would confirm that the assessing agency has an approved plan, rather than conducting a singular or direct state assessment of candidates. The creation of a technical assistance network would increase the probability of coherence and comparability of support and assessment plans. The appeals process will protect teachers from the confounding of the tenure and credentialing processes.

Methods

Each employing district, if it wishes to hire candidates with preliminary credentials, would need to create, alone or in a consortium (which should include colleges or universities with pre-service teacher education programs), a formal support and assessment plan for beginning teachers that addresses the general constructs of the State Teaching Framework (STF). The model anticipates that the plans would vary depending on the experience of the district, the preferences of the community, the local School Board, the teacher organization or bargaining agent, the level of local funding, and the existing support and assessment practices. Each plan must show, however, that the local support services would provide each candidate with a reasonable opportunity to meet the standards set in the assessment component of the plan.

To help districts in the planning and development process, the state would host a series of planning seminars to provide districts with the findings from the CNTF studies on beginning teacher support and assessment. Following such planning seminars, a technical assistance network would be available to provide participants with ongoing help during the planning and development phase. Based on the information from the planning seminars, other published research, technical assistance, and local experience, the districts would choose one or more of the state recommended support practices and assessment approaches or propose their own. Once developed and approved at the local level (i.e., accepted by the teachers' bargaining agent and the local school board), the district support and assessment plans would be reviewed and evaluated by regional panels of state-

trained educators to ensure adherence to the State Teaching Framework and to preserve fairness and equity. Procedures would be developed to permit debate between districts and regional panels, and some type of appeal process by districts of the decision of the regional hearing panels to the appropriate state agencies would be established. The State Teaching Framework would show the threshold level of beginning teacher competence to be addressed in all approved plans.

All plans also would agree to abide by the state appeal process for teachers whereby candidates who believe they have been unfairly or improperly evaluated by the employing district can obtain an impartial hearing before a regional review panel composed of teachers, teacher educators, and/or administrators. Members of the panels would be recruited, trained, and monitored by the state. The provision of an appeals process is important to protect teachers from unfair credentialing evaluations which result in the denial of a professional teaching credential. Regional review panels would examine the assessment documentation to determine whether or not it justifies the recommendation to deny a teaching credential. This appeals hearing would only address licensure and would not alter the district's authority over employment. The candidate must request the formal hearing within a reasonable time of the district decision.

A site review team process, included in this model, would protect teachers and ensure that the state's concerns are being properly met through the proposed local programs after initial approval is granted. This will include review of supporting documents for a sample of teachers. Over time, promising support and assessment practices developed by districts would be disseminated so that other districts can improve their support and assessment practices. The state can, if desired, request volunteer districts to pilot-test future assessments other than those tested in the CNTF, and make the results of those efforts available to districts. An alternate option is to limit the site visits to those districts where complaints from teachers have been received. This would substantially reduce the time and costs involved and focus the follow-up on those districts where the process of support and assessment may not be functioning properly. With this option, all other districts would make periodic written reports about their support and assessment plan with particular attention to any changes made in procedures or methods.

Technical Quality

The technical quality of this model is moderate because the only consistent element is the required use of the proposed state framework for beginning teachers. All other elements in the support and assessment practices can vary across districts. Although it is likely that most districts would choose similar methods of assuring that their teachers meet the general constructs of the framework, there is no required assessment approach that the districts must use. The technical assistance network would help districts to develop acceptable assessment practices and should reduce the work of the review panels. Should the state train local assessors in any of the assessment approaches piloted by the CNTF, that training should increase the technical quality and consistency of the assessments chosen by the districts. The support and assessment plan review process would need to consider the issue of local assessment practices judged to be unacceptable. One option is to limit school districts' selection to an approved list of assessment approaches, but this would limit district choice which is a primary advantage of this model. Districts that choose unusual assessment approaches should be advised to prepare justifications for the selection of such approaches.

Purposes and Uses

This model encourages both formative and summative evaluation through the linkage of the support and assessment methods and the extensive feedback all teachers receive on their performances prior to the final, summative, decision on credentialing. The State Teaching Framework provides a set of guiding constructs for institutions of higher education and local educational agencies to use in making their support and assessment programs congruent. By providing a common language and common expectations with regard to beginning teachers' knowledge and skills, the state can reinforce efforts to bridge pre-service and in-service teacher education. For example, those districts working collaboratively with teacher education programs could easily develop linked curricula, support, and assessment activities.

Advantages of Model Two

- Mandates the improvement of support and assessment activities at the pre-service and in-service levels, and provides guidance and assistance to involved agencies
- Addresses current unevenness in the scope, rigor, and helpfulness of current beginning teacher assessments
- Raises the minimum standards that beginning teachers must meet while providing support for them
- Creates and/or strengthens links between universities and school districts by fostering collaborations
- Creates a system for monitoring the quality of beginning teacher assessments
- Allows credential programs and districts to build preferred support and assessment activities as long as mandated criteria and standards are met

Disadvantages of Model Two

- Does not fulfill intent of S.B. 148 (the Bergeson Act) because the model does not require a state assessment for beginning teachers
- Does not guarantee the improvement of all support and assessment practices due to the lag between monitoring and implementation of plans for support and assessment
- Does not eliminate potential variance in scope, rigor, and helpfulness of planned assessments
- Some administrators may confound tenure and credentialing decisions, requiring a lengthy appeals process for redress

- Districts wishing to dismiss marginal teachers can diminish their legal liability by awarding tenure and recommending the denial of a professional teaching credential
- Uses limited resources for plans and activities that do not lead directly to support and assessment for beginning teachers
- Districts with the fewest resources and greatest needs in support and assessment may be impacted adversely by this model

Start-up Costs for the Program Review Model

Rationale. The initial expenses of the Program Review with Technical Assistance Model involve the final development and dissemination of the State Teaching Framework (STF), including statewide workshops on the definitions of teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities addressed in the framework, methods for assessing the knowledge, skills, and abilities, and appropriate support activities for beginning teachers. These workshops may not require any additional permanent positions for the CTC or DE. The technical assistance network, however, would require additional positions to provide the needed help to program developers. The evaluation and approval of district plans for support and assessment would have significant, though temporary, costs as over 750 plans⁷ would need to be reviewed and approved. Using trained educators borrowed from districts, county offices, and colleges and universities to serve as reviewers would reduce costs, but travel and per diem expenses would be significant. The training of state level program reviewers would involve two days of training at four or five locations around the state. Three days of meetings would complete the initial review process at the regional sites, assuming that 10 evaluators work in teams at each site.⁸ The actual reviewers would be working educators who would be paid for their direct expenses only, which is existing state practice.

A small group of experts (estimated at no more than seven individuals) in the field of education would be identified and trained to serve as an appeals board in those cases where districts or consortia appeal the decisions of the review panels. This group may not need to meet after all plans are approved.

Besides training reviewers of proposed support and assessment plans, those individuals conducting the district site reviews also must be trained. These costs would be incurred only if the state adopts the practice of site review for all assessment plans. This would require additional training activities around the state to build a pool of site evaluators. The costs of this component are predicated on a model of regular site evaluations of all district and consortia plans. This would mean conducting over 100 site visits a year, assuming a seven year cycle of visits. Small districts or consortia of districts could be reviewed by individual reviewers, but large districts or consortia may need four members. The proposed costs assume an average of three members per team and 100+ visits per year. The pool of evaluators would need to include about 400 people to prevent excess use of individual evaluators. Should the state adopt the option of making site visits only to districts or consortia where beginning teachers have filed appeals with the

regional review panel, the costs of training and maintaining the site visit component would be reduced by two-thirds⁹.

Finally, teachers who believe they were evaluated unfairly could receive a hearing through the appeal process. Regional review panels would be composed of selected teachers, administrators, and professors would need to be identified and trained, and procedures would need to be written and approved for this appeal process. The CTC might need to select a final hearing board or group that would report its recommendations to the Commission.

Estimated Start-up Costs for Model Two.

1. Informational Workshops for districts (see Research Dissemination Model for details)	\$174,406
2. Technical Assistance Network (per year) (See Research Dissemination Model for details)	\$571,642
2. Development of Procedures and Training of Plan Reviewers	
Personnel 160 staff days @ \$318.52 per day	\$ 50,963
State Travel & Per Diem 20 days	\$ 4,320
Materials & Misc.	\$ 3,000
Facilities Rent 4 locations, 2 days each, @\$250 per	\$ 2,000
Participant Travel 50 people 1 trip @ \$100 per	\$ 5,000
Participant Per Diem 50 people, 2 days @ \$116 per day	<u>\$ 11,600</u>
TOTAL costs for Training Plan Reviewers	\$ 76,883
3. Evaluation of All District & Consortia Plans	
Personnel 100 staff days @ \$318.53 per day	\$ 31,853
Staff Travel & Per Diem 30 days	\$ 6,480
Materials & Misc.	\$ 1,000
Facilities Rent 25 days @ \$250 per day	\$ 6,250
Participant Travel 50 people & 1 trip @ \$100 per	\$ 5,000
Participant Per Diem 50 people, 3 days @ \$116 per day	<u>\$ 17,400</u>
TOTAL costs for Evaluating Plans	\$ 67,983
4. District Plan Appeals Board Training	
Personnel 10 staff days @ \$318.53 per day	\$ 3,185
Staff Travel & Per Diem 5 days	\$ 1,080
Materials & Misc.	\$ 250
Facilities Rent 5 days @ \$250	\$ 1,250
Participant Travel 7 people, 1 trip @ \$100 per	\$ 700
Participant Per Diem 7 people, 2 days @ \$116	<u>\$ 1,624</u>
TOTAL costs for District Plan Appeals Board Training	\$ 8,089

⁹ This figure is based on the CTC records of credential programs receiving less than full approval (roughly one-third of the programs each year)

5. Site Reviewers Training (all plans evaluated)

Personnel 100 staff days @ \$318.53 per day	\$ 31,853
Staff Travel & per diem 40 days	\$ 8,640
Materials & Misc	\$ 4,000
Facilities Rent 32 days @ \$250	\$ 8,000
Participant Travel 400 people, 1 trip @ \$100 per	\$ 40,000
Participant Per Diem 400 people, 2 days @ \$116	<u>\$ 90,800</u>
TOTAL costs for Training Reviewers (all plans Evaluated)	\$183,293

6. Teacher Credential Regional Review Panels Training

Personnel 20 staff days @ \$318.53 per day	\$ 6,370
Staff Travel & per diem 5 days	\$ 1,080
Materials & Misc	\$ 600
Facilities Rent 2 days @ \$250	\$ 500
Participant Travel 30 people @ \$100	\$ 3,000
Participant per diem 30 people, 2 days @ \$116	<u>\$ 6,960</u>
TOTAL costs for training Members of Regional Review Panels	\$ 18,510

TOTAL Start-up Costs of Model Two

\$1,100,805

Ongoing Costs for the Program Review Model: Rationale. Once approved, the district support and assessment plans would require some additional permanent state staff to coordinate the planned site visits. Besides the start-up costs involved in training the site evaluators, the ongoing costs of planning, conducting, and monitoring these visits would be significant. If selected, the alternate option (only visiting the districts with complaints on record) would reduce the ongoing costs of the site visits.

Choosing the all-sites option means the site visits would be conducted by small teams (two to four trained evaluators), who would interview a sample of district support providers, district assessors, beginning teachers who completed the process, and beginning teachers currently participating in the plan. The role of the state would be to recruit individuals to serve as evaluators, to train them in the program evaluation procedures, and to monitor the site visits and the subsequent filing of reports. Annual reports by state staff would be made to the relevant public bodies, (e.g., Commission on Teacher Credentialing, State Board of Education) regarding the general issues and recommendations for improvement. Ongoing training would be needed for district personnel (some of this should be mandated in administrator preparation programs) and for new program evaluators.

The planned appeal process would require staff to handle the paperwork, but the staff employed to plan and monitor the site visits should have time for this occasional task. Per diem costs for the panelists would depend on the number of cases heard and the length of time needed for review and decision.

If the state were to maintain a seven year cycle of plan review and have 750 plans submitted, then approximately 100 teams a year would be needed. Given the reluctance of many educators to be away from their schools, the pool of trained evaluators would likely exceed 400 people (one visit per team member every other

year). To plan and monitor the visits and the appeals would likely require four full-time equivalent employees plus clerical assistance.

Estimated Ongoing Costs for Program Review Model

1. Continuing Site Visits & Appeals (all districts visited)

Personnel	4 FTE ¹⁰	\$318,528
Staff Travel	100 trips @ \$100 per trip	\$ 10,000
Staff Per Diem	100 trips @ \$116 per day	\$ 11,600
Materials & Misc		\$ 5,000
Evaluators Travel	325 trips @ \$100 per trip	\$ 32,500
Evaluators Per Diem	325 people, 2 days each	\$ 75,400
Appeal Board Travel	7 people, 5 trips	\$ 3,500
Appeal Board Per Diem	7 people, 5 trips, 2 days	<u>\$ 8,120</u>
TOTAL Annual Expenses for full site visit option		\$464,648
TOTAL Annual Expenses for selected site option		\$153,334

2. Continuing Training Costs

Personnel	20 staff days @ \$318.53 per day	\$ 6,371
Staff Travel & Per Diem	5 days	\$ 1,080
Materials & Misc		\$ 1,000
Facilities Rent	4 days @ \$250	\$ 1,000
Participant Travel	100 people, 1 trip @ \$100	\$ 10,000
Participant Per Diem	100 people, 2 days @ \$116	<u>\$ 23,200</u>
TOTAL Continuing training costs		\$ 42,651
TOTAL Ongoing Costs per year (all-site option)		\$507,299
TOTAL Ongoing Costs per year (selected site option)		\$195,985

Model Three: Staged Assessment with Technical Assistance Model

Overview

This model is a staged support and assessment plan that combines local support and assessment in the first year of teaching, supported by a technical assistance network, with state-mandated assessments, linked to district support, in the following year(s) of teaching. By requiring local school districts to assess first-year teachers through practices supported by the technical assistance network, the model acknowledges differences in local support and assessment activities while ensuring equity and rigor. By implementing state-defined assessment approaches after the first year of teaching, the state assures comparability of and fairness in assessment approaches and permits comparative data to be collected and reviewed with regard to teacher preparation and district support activities. In addition, the model embraces the developmental aspect of learning to teach by delaying the

¹⁰ This figure is based on a salary of \$54,858 and benefits of 45% of base salary.

evaluation of some domains of teaching until the candidate has had an opportunity to practice them in authentic settings.

This model, like the program review model, links staged support and assessment activities to staged credentialing. The initial credential for teaching would be the Preliminary Credential, valid for a fixed period, which signifies that the holder can assume teaching responsibilities while obtaining further assistance and development. To qualify for the Professional Credential, the candidate would be assessed first by local assessors trained by the state, and then by a state-defined process that may be locally administered. This model places the state directly into candidate-centered assessment for credentialing purposes by having the state select the second stage assessment approaches and train local educators in their use.

The beginning teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities specified in the State Teaching Framework (STF) would be assessed by the local school district assessment practices and the state assessment approaches. Institutions of higher education with approved teacher credential programs might wish to modify their assessment approach(es) to fit the STF and the state-selected assessment approach(es), but this model does not require them to do so. The technical assistance network would help teacher education programs and local school districts to assess certain elements of the STF. The model provides for two options to control costs. One option calls for all candidates to complete all assessments. The second option would require candidates judged marginal to complete the second state assessment.

If a candidate passed the assessments created by the local districts (Stage 1) and those developed by the state (Stage 2), the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) would grant the professional credential upon receipt of the candidate's application with the assessment results attached. Because the state would be accepting the professional judgments of many individuals around the state, this model includes the creation of regional review panels that would adjudicate teacher complaints regarding their credentialing assessment.

Standards

This model sets specific state-wide requirements for supporting and assessing teachers but allows some latitude for first year support and assessment of teachers. In this manner, local issues and needs could be added to the initial assessment, and state-level concerns could be addressed with the later evaluations. The use of stages permits greater coverage of the STF constructs and adheres to a developmental view of teaching by delaying the assessment of certain constructs until after the first year of teaching. Moreover, initial support activities could be focussed on the planned assessments so that teachers would receive feedback on their developing knowledge, skills, and abilities and have full opportunities to prepare for the assessments under supportive conditions. This model is the most complete application of the findings of the CNTF and establishes the most uniform standards for beginning teacher support and assessment.

Methods

At the first stage of assessment, teachers would be evaluated according to recommended classroom observation practices (e.g., the Connecticut Competency Instrument or a California equivalent) in conjunction with compatible existing

school district practices. The primary focus of the first-stage assessment would be on general pedagogical skills, especially the sections of the STF on classroom organization and management, delivery of instruction, and monitoring and adjusting instruction. (CNTF research suggests that these domains are already part of many existing pre-service and first-year assessment practices). The technical assistance network would assist teacher education programs and school districts in preparing or revising assessment practices to meet these standards. Teacher education programs and districts could also assess other constructs or topics if desired.

All teachers would receive feedback and support based on this initial assessment; those teachers evaluated as "marginal" or in need of assistance to meet expectations would be assigned heightened support through a formal plan for improvement. If a teacher is unable to completely meet the expectations for the first stage assessment (conducted by and for the employing district), advancement to the second-stage assessments might be delayed. Outright failure, however, would warrant dismissal from the district and possible suspension of the Preliminary Credential. Programs of teacher preparation would be expected, wherever feasible, to seek data about their graduates' performance on such assessments as a part of the credential program's own evaluation process. Teachers leaving a district after the first-stage review (the local district assessment) would be required to show the results of that assessment to the receiving district, which would use the results in developing its support plan for the new employee.

At the second stage of assessment, teachers would be evaluated by state-defined assessment activities. District support plans would be oriented toward helping teachers in acquiring the knowledge, skills, and abilities measured by these assessments, but could focus on local concerns as well. Although these state-defined assessment approaches would continue to have some focus on the skills addressed in the classroom observation instrument, the primary foci, drawn from the STF, would be on planning and designing instruction in the assigned content areas, diagnosing and evaluating student learning, and participating in a learning community. Three alternative options for implementing Model Three are described.

Option A - All candidates complete two assessments. The initial state assessment would be a portfolio developed in the first or second year of teaching with a semi-structured interview about the portfolio conducted by a state-trained evaluator. At the elementary level, the candidates must choose one of two general academic areas for the content of the portfolio - Math/Science or Reading/Writing. The portfolio would cover a unit of instruction from the candidate's current teaching assignment, including entries such as lesson plans, student work, and teacher commentaries with analysis. Elementary teachers would be encouraged to select their strongest teaching area for this first portfolio. For secondary teachers, the initial portfolio would focus on the primary content area of certification (e.g., Mathematics, English, Social Science). Its content would parallel that of the elementary portfolio. In both cases, the purpose of the semi-structured interview is twofold. It would ensure that it was the candidate who actually completed the portfolio and would enable the candidate to talk about students and curriculum personally. This should reduce any biasing effects of the attractiveness of the presentation and provide a balanced assessment of the teacher's competence in the target domains.

The second assessment would also be a second portfolio with a semi-structured interview, but in a different content area. Elementary teachers would select the other content area (Math/Science or Reading/Writing) and secondary teachers would select a sub-field within the primary teaching area or a supplemental teaching area if appropriate. The purpose of the second assessment is to provide information about the candidate's competence across subjects as pedagogical content knowledge varies by subject matter. The portfolio with a semi-structured interview about the portfolio provides the evaluator with an opportunity to tap all the domains of the State Teaching Framework not covered in the classroom observations.

Option B - Marginal candidates complete two assessments. This option would require only candidates who perform at a marginal level on the initial portfolio with semi-structured interview to receive focused support activities and to complete a second portfolio in a new content area. This would reduce the costs of the staged assessment model and focus the support and assessment efforts on those who need it most. All candidates would complete the classroom observations and one portfolio that would give the state sufficient information to warrant the awarding of a Professional Credential.

Option C - Phased Implementation. This option would gradually implement Model Three over time by first requiring these assessments for those individuals who were not prepared in California credential programs, or who entered teaching through alternative routes such as an emergency certificate. These teachers represent a subpopulation of beginning teachers who would not have been prepared under the proposed State Teaching Framework. Beginning with this well-defined subpopulation, the early efforts toward alternative assessment can be more easily accomplished, and their assessment results would provide policymakers with useful information on beginning teachers' development and performance. Model Three could subsequently be extended to include California-prepared candidates after it has been shown to work effectively in its initial applications.

General Implementation

The time allocated for these assessments would vary depending on the background and training of the candidate. Those who wish to complete the entire assessment package in one year may choose to do so, but the typical candidate would take two years to complete this process. If Option A is selected, it may be necessary to delay the tenure decision to permit candidates a third year to prepare the second portfolio. Some experimentation would be needed to determine the impact of preparing such portfolios on beginning teachers.

The state-defined assessments (performance on the classroom observation and the portfolio(s) with semi-structured interview) would be evaluated by local educators who have received state-sponsored training. Both assessments would provide detailed feedback to the candidate and directions for beginning teacher support. Teachers assessed as "marginal" or in need of assistance to pass the combined assessments would be given heightened support corresponding to a formal plan of improvement. Should a teacher move from one district to another before completing the state-defined assessments, the new district would receive information from the previous district about the candidate's status.

Teachers who pass the state-defined assessments would receive a Professional Credential, and school districts could use the results of this assessment process in making tenure decisions. The model does not address the relationship between credentialing and permanent employment. Option B permits all state licensure issues to be completed prior to the tenure decision, and even Option A does not preclude some candidates from completing the proposed assessment in two years. The relevant state agencies could seek legislation to delay the onset of tenure until more years of teaching had passed, to permit districts the option of giving some teachers another year or two of support and experience to meet the state defined assessments. In this model, teachers who fail the state-defined assessments would be released from service by the district and, possibly, lose their Preliminary Credential as well. The Commission on Teacher Credentialing might want to support special programs for candidates who seek help and reinstatement of their Preliminary Credential.

Technical Quality

The technical quality of this model rests on the alternative assessment research completed by the CNTP. Through that research, the state has begun defining the framework for beginning teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities and widely disseminate that framework, once developed. In addition, the state would assist universities and school districts in responding to the framework and the proposed methods of assessment. The state would define the classroom observation method to be used, again based on the adopted framework and would train local educators in its use. Finally, the state would define the second stage assessment and train local educators in its use to ensure equity and comparability. If the state chooses Option A, the "practice effect" should increase the likelihood that beginning teachers can meet both the depth and breadth aspects of the STF. The state's development of the assessment methods and its training and technical assistance network should ensure a high level of reliability, validity, and rigor. The use of a combination of methods spread over time taps a broad array of beginning teacher knowledge and skills in a manner that reduces the adverse impacts on the beginning teacher. The model also encourages the formative uses of the assessments and provides the beginning teacher with contextually specific information. The use of common assessment methods throughout the state would help to provide additional data to assess the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs and new teacher support programs.

Purposes and Uses

This model allows both formative and summative evaluation uses in the support and assessment activities and addresses not only the pedagogical constructs in the STF but also incorporates the findings about alternative assessment approaches pilot-tested by the CNTP. Using these pilot-tested approaches with local assessment practices in the first year of teaching permits attention to the variations in teaching experiences in California schools. Requiring assessment over time ensures coverage of the entire STF without placing an excessive burden on the beginning teacher in any one year. This approach also acknowledges the developmental nature of teaching and would delay the assessment of the more sophisticated teaching skills until later in the developmental process. The additional information generated about beginning teacher knowledge and skill development should provide useful information for state agencies, local school districts, and teacher preparation programs.

Advantages of Model Three

- Fulfills the intent of Senate Bill 148 (the Bergeson Act) by establishing state assessment of beginning teachers
- Mandates specific types of assessment activities that have high potential for measuring teaching skills, and for providing feedback to beginning teachers
- Reduces the unevenness in the scope, rigor, and helpfulness of current assessments of beginning teachers
- Raises minimum standards for beginning teachers while providing focused support for them
- Adds new standards for beginning teachers in the area of content pedagogy
- Creates a system for strengthening the technical quality of beginning teacher assessments
- Provides universities and policymakers with detailed information about beginning teacher knowledge and skills
- Combines state standards with assessment methods that are sensitive to varied work settings and teaching assignments

Disadvantages of Model Three

- Increases the complexity of and potentially lengthens the process for obtaining a Professional Credential
- Increases the cost of credentialing teachers in California
- Reduces autonomy of local districts in retention practices
- May require changes in teacher tenure laws

Probable Costs of Staged Assessment Model: Rationale. Since each district or group of districts would need evaluators trained in the use of the instruments selected by the state, training costs would be significant. If we assume that each assessor could complete 12 assessments a year, then 1,000 evaluators would be needed state-wide. Each assessment would take up to two full work days or more, depending on the travel time involved. If the state selects Option A, two portfolios with semi-structured interviews per candidate, at least 48,000 work-days per year would be required. If the state selects Option B, the number of work-days would drop, depending on the number of candidates needing the second portfolio exercise. Assuming one-third of the teachers require the second portfolio, the state-wide total of work days involved in assessing 12,000 beginning teachers under Option B would be 32,000. Calculating the actual dollar cost for evaluator days of work depends on the salary level of the school employee charged with this new task. If Assistant Principals or similar administrators conduct the assessments, the additional direct costs could exceed \$25 million per

year.¹¹ If the state did not pay evaluators directly, but asked them to perform these vital services on loan from their regular employer (as is true for many educational evaluation practices), the cost of a staged assessment system would be reduced by two-thirds. The budget figures presented assume that the evaluators' salaries and benefits would be paid by the state.

Additional costs include the development of the technical assistance network, direct training expenses for these evaluators plus ongoing training for replacements, indirect costs of materials produced for training and monitoring the assessment process, and agency staff time. Regional review boards must be trained in their role and, once established, would have travel and related costs. Additionally, some districts or consortia of districts may choose to employ evaluators from outside their district or consortia of districts to avoid confounding support and assessment roles.

¹¹This number was calculated by assuming that Assistant Principals worked 200 days per year and received salary and benefits equal to \$85,000 per year.

Estimated Start-up Costs for Model Three, Options A and B

1. Informational Workshops for districts (see Research Dissemination Model for details)	\$174,406
2. Technical Assistance Network (per year) (See Research Dissemination Model for details)	\$571,642
3. Assessor Training (five days of training - 10 locations)	
Personnel 100 staff days @ \$318.53 per day	\$ 31,854
Staff Travel & Per Diem 50 days @ \$216 per day	\$10,800
Materials & Misc	\$ 6,000
Facilities Rent 50 days @ \$250 per day	\$ 12,500
Participant Travel 1,000 people @ \$100 per trip	\$100,000
Participant Per Diem 1,000 people, 5 days @ \$116 per day	<u>\$580,000</u>
TOTAL Costs for Training Assessors	\$741,154

4. Regional Hearing Panels Training

Personnel 20 staff days @ \$318.53 per day	\$ 6,371
Staff Travel & Per Diem 5 days @ \$216 per day	\$ 1,080
Materials & Misc	\$ 600
Facilities Rent 2 days @ \$250 per day	\$ 500
Participant Travel 30 people @ \$100 per trip	\$ 3,000
Participant Per Diem 30 people, 2 days @ \$116 per day	<u>\$ 6,960</u>
TOTAL costs for Regional Hearing Panels	\$ 18,511

Ongoing Costs of Model Three, Option A (All Candidates Assessed).

1. Evaluation of Beginning Teachers for the Professional Credential

Personnel 4.0 FTE	\$ 318,528
Staff Travel & Per Diem 200 days @ \$216 per day	\$ 43,200
Materials & Misc.	\$ 20,000
Evaluator Travel 6,000 trips ¹²	\$ 600,000
Evaluator per diem 48,000 days @ \$116 per day	\$ 5,568,000
Evaluator Salary & Benefits @ \$425 per day	<u>\$20,400,000</u>
TOTAL costs for assessing teachers	\$26,949,728

¹² Some trips will involve more than one new teacher, depending on the location of the new teachers.

2. Appeal Board for Beginning Teachers

Appeal Board travel 30 people, 5 trips	
@ \$100 per trip	\$ 15,000
Appeal Board per diem 30 people, 25 days	
@ \$116 per day	<u>\$ 87,000</u>
TOTAL costs of Appeal Board	\$102,000
 TOTAL Start-up and Ongoing Costs for Option A	 \$28,557,441

Option B - Costs of Model Three, (Marginal Candidates Assessed Twice).

1. Evaluation of Beginning Teachers for the Professional Credential

Personnel	2.0 FTE	\$ 159,264
Staff Travel & Per Diem 100 days,		
@ \$216 per day		\$ 21,600
Materials & Misc.		\$ 10,000
Evaluator Travel	4,000 trips ¹³ @ \$100 per trip	\$ 400,000
Evaluator Per Diem 32,000 days @ \$116 per day		\$ 3,712,000
Evaluator Salary & Benefits @ \$425 per day		<u>\$13,600,000</u>
TOTAL costs for assessing teachers		\$17,902,864

2. Appeal Board for Beginning Teachers

Appeal Board Travel 30 people,	
5 trips @ \$100 per trip	\$ 15,000
Appeal Board Per Diem 30 people,	
25 days @ \$116 per day	<u>\$ 87,000</u>
TOTAL costs of Appeal Board	\$ 102,000
 TOTAL Start-up and Ongoing Costs for Option B	 \$18,004,864

Costs of Model Three, Option C (Phased Implementation).

Costs for implementing Option C are difficult to calculate, as they are affected by the distribution of affected teachers. It seems likely, however, that they would be no more than those of Option B.

¹³ Some trips will involve more than one new teacher, depending on the location of the new teachers and the nature of the state-defined assessment.